

Serial No.: 10/689,776
Examiner: Nguyen T. Ha
Reply to Office Action Mailed January 25, 2008
Page 6 of 7

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 has been revised. Support for the revisions can be found in Fig. 2, and page 10, lines 24-26, page 11, lines 11-12 and 18-24 of the specification, among other places. New claims 13-19 have been added. Support for new claim 13 can be found in Fig. 2 and page 4, line 23 to page 5, line 11 of the specification, among other places. New claims 14-19 are original claims 5-10 rewritten in independent form. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 3-19 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shirashige et al. (US6,467,142). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. Applicant is not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to claim 2.

Claim 1 requires a solid electrolytic capacitor including a porous sintered body of valve metal that has a plurality of sintered elements. This configuration helps increase the capacitance and reduces the equivalent series inductance of the capacitor (see page 4, line 23 to page 5, line 11 of the specification, among other places), and in turn significantly enhances the noise cancellation and the high-frequency characteristics of the capacitor.

Shirashige et al. fail to disclose the porous sintered body of valve metal including a plurality of sintered elements as required by claim 1. Instead, Shirashige et al. merely discuss a method for manufacturing chip capacitors, including making a plurality of capacitors on a terminal frame and cutting them into individual chip capacitors (see Shirashige et al., Abstract and Figs. 2-7). This is completely distinct from the invention of claim 1, which is directed to a solid electrolytic capacitor including a porous sintered body of valve metal that has a plurality of sintered elements. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Shirashige et al. Claims 3-4 and 11-12 depend ultimately from claim 1 and are patentable along with claim 1 and need not be separately distinguished at

Serial No.: 10/589,776
Examiner: Nguyen T. Ha
Reply to Office Action Mailed January 25, 2008
Page 7 of 7

this time. Applicant is not conceding the relevance of the rejection to the remaining features of the rejected claims.

Applicant notes that the drawings filed on August 17, 2006 have not been acknowledged on the Office Action Summary Sheet and respectfully requests the drawings be acknowledged in a further communication.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612) 455-3804.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300

Dated: June 24, 2008

DPM/cy